

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/846,658	05/01/97	ADAIR	

HM22/0213

DAVIS, M. EXAMINER

FRANCIS A PAINTIN
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
MACKIEWICZ AND NORRIS
ONE LIBERTY PLACE 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	

02/13/01

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary	Application No. 08/846,658	Applicant(s) ADAIR et al
	Examiner Minh-Tam Davis	Group Art Unit 1642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Minh-Tam Davis

(3) Anthony Caputa

(2) Doreen Y. Trujillo

(4) Julie Burke

Date of Interview Feb 8, 2001

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed:

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

1) The amendment of Sep/14/2000 will be entered, and new matter rejection will be withdrawn. 2) The remaining issue is 102(e) rejection as anticipated by Queen et al. Applicant argues that except one fortuitous paragraph in the specification of the application by Queen et al, 07/290975 (p. 8, last para. bridging first para, p.9) that defines CDR's as hypervariable regions, and refers to Kabat and Cholthia, the rest of the specification of 07/290975 only discloses Kabat CDRs, and that in one of the examples, actually an amino acid in Cholthia CDR's is altered.

Rejection remains after consultation with a Biotech. Specialist.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.